

## Planning Sub-Committee B

Tuesday 1 November 2016

7.00 pm

Meeting Room, G02, Ground Floor, 160 Tooley Street  
London SE1 2QH

## Supplemental Agenda No.1

### List of Contents

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
7.	Development management items – Addendum report	1 - 4

#### **Contact**

Beverley Olamijulo on 020 7525 7234 or email: [beverley.olamijulo@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:beverley.olamijulo@southwark.gov.uk)  
Webpage: [www.southwark.gov.uk](http://www.southwark.gov.uk)

Date: 1 November 2016

<b>Item No:</b> 7.	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 1 November 2016	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Planning Sub-Committee B
<b>Report title:</b>		<b>Addendum</b> Late observations, consultation responses, and further information.	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		Rotherhithe and Peckham Rye	
<b>From:</b>		Director of Planning	

### PURPOSE

1. To advise Members of observations, consultation responses and further information received in respect of the following planning applications on the main agenda. These were received after the preparation of the report and the matters raised may not therefore have been taken in to account in reaching the recommendation stated.

### RECOMMENDATION

2. That Members note and consider the late observations, consultation responses and information received in respect of each item in reaching their decision.

### FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

3. Late observations, consultation responses, information and revisions have been received in respect of the following planning applications on the main agenda:

#### **Item 7.1 – Application 16/AP/3387 for: Council’s Own Development – Reg 3 – Southwark Park, Gomm Road, London SE16 2EH**

##### Clarification – Impact on trees

- 3.1 Condition 6 of the draft recommendation requires details of new tree planting to be submitted for approval. This is in order to mitigate the loss of six trees which would be required in order to accommodate the proposed new building, as detailed in Paragraph 28 of the Report. Officers recommend that the wording of condition 6 be amended to make it clear that the replacement trees must be at least of an equivalent quality to those which would be removed. The suggested change to the condition wording is as follows:

“Prior to works commencing, full details of all proposed tree planting which shall be of at least an equivalent quality to the trees to be removed to mitigate any loss shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All tree planting shall be carried out in accordance with those details and at those times..... If within a period of five years.....”

##### Clarification – Sustainable development implications

- 3.2 Paragraphs 44 to 47 of the report detail the sustainability measures to be incorporated within the development and the associated BREEAM rating that can be achieved. Condition 9 of the draft recommendation requires the development to achieve at least

BREEAM 'good' and for a BREEAM certificate confirming this to be submitted to the Council for approval before the building is occupied. Given the modest scale of the proposed development and the cost associated with obtaining a formal BREEAM certificate, the applicant has requested that the requirement to obtain a certificate be omitted.

- 3.3 The applicant has already provided a BREEAM pre-assessment report setting out which measures would be provided to achieve 'Good', and officers recommend that this be reflected in the condition wording. Whilst the modest scale of the development is recognised, officers consider that there should be a mechanism for ensuring that the measures described in the BREEAM report are actually delivered. It is therefore recommended that the condition wording be amended to require the applicant to submit evidence of this, but without having to provide a formal certificate. The suggested change to the condition wording is as follows:

- (a) ~~"Before any fit out works to the building hereby authorised begins, an independently verified BREEAM report (detailing performance in each category, overall score, BREEAM rating and a BREEAM certificate of building performance) to achieve a minimum 'good' rating shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with any such approval given; The development shall be carried out in accordance with the BREEAM pre-assessment report by Hilson Moran dated 18<sup>th</sup> July 2016 (revision 1)."~~
- (a) "Before the first occupation of the building hereby permitted, ~~a certified Post Construction Review (or other verification process agreed with the local planning authority)~~ evidence that the measures set out in the BREEAM pre-assessment report to achieve the agreed standards set out at (a) have been provided shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, ~~confirming that the agreed standards at (a) have been met."~~

Additional representation – Council's Environmental Protection Team

- 3.4 Paragraph 41 sets out the need for a standard condition reflecting the potential for on-site contamination. Since the officer report was written, the Council's Environmental Protection Team has reviewed the contamination report which was submitted with the application, and has advised that it is acceptable and no conditions are required. Condition 7 of the draft recommendation, which requires a contamination study to be undertaken, should therefore be deleted.

Additional representation - Council's Flood Risk Management Team

- 3.5 Paragraph 38 acknowledges that a Flood Risk Assessment has been prepared by the applicant. The council's flood risk management team and now responded to state that the Flood Risk Assessment provided is acceptable. No conditions are required and the applicant should consider the points made by the Environment Agency.

**Item 7.2 – Application 16/AP/3203 for: Full Planning Permission – Homestall Road Playing Fields, (Athenlay FC) Homestall Road, London SE22**

Clarification – Impact on trees

- 3.6 Paragraphs 53 and 54 refer to the impact on trees as a result of this development. To clarify, the proposal will result in the loss of two category U trees (Ash and Norway maple, both of poor quality located on the eastern boundary of the site close to the

entrance gate) and seven category C trees on the site of the proposed facility. An indicative scheme for replacement trees has been discussed with the council's urban forester that would involve the planting of 18 trees on the boundary (These are to include Beech, Yew, Hawthorn and Spindle hedge; 5 x Common Lime, 1 x Beech, 5 x Oak, 3 x Walnut and 5 x Aspen at minimum 10-12cm stem girth, container grown). Officers are satisfied that this is an improvement to what is currently on site, but the condition is worded so that it allows further dialogue between officers as individual trees are selected.

- 3.7 Drawing No: 001 – Tree planting details removed from the permission and will now be controlled through the introduction of above condition allowing the Council's urban forester to be more prescriptive in regards to replacement trees.

Additional representation: Sport England

- 3.8 Sport England commented that the proposed pavilion would sit closer to the playing pitches than the existing building therefore Sport England would need to be satisfied that a 3 metre 'run off' safety area between the pitch and the proposed pavilion would be retained.

Officer's comments

- 3.9 The developer confirmed that a 3 metre 'run off' area would be retained between the new building and all existing pitches.

Additional representation: Sport England

- 3.10 Sport England commented that the proposed pavilion would contain two changing rooms but the whole site has four playing pitches therefore Sport England has concern that the proposed pavilion would be unable to support the needs of the whole site. .

Officer's comments

- 3.11 The developer replied to Sport England's concerns that the new building will be a modular building, and will therefore be easy to extend or modify at a later date, if required. This could be done by adding additional bays or extending to the west of the new building.

**REASON FOR URGENCY**

4. Applications are required by statute to be considered as speedily as possible. The application has been publicised as being on the agenda for consideration at this meeting of the Planning Committee and applicants and objectors have been invited to attend the meeting to make their views known. Deferral would delay the processing of the applications and would inconvenience all those who attend the meeting

**REASON FOR LATENESS**

5. The new information, comments reported and corrections to the main report and recommendation have been noted and/or received since the committee agenda was printed. They all relate to an item on the agenda and Members should be aware of the objections and comments made.

**BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

<b>Background Papers</b>	<b>Held At</b>	<b>Contact</b>
Individual files	Chief Executive's Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403